Draft version September 27, 2012
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1209.5748v1 [astro-ph.CO] 25 Sep 2012

ISOTROPIC HEATING OF GALAXY CLUSTER CORES VIA RAPIDLY REORIENTING AGN JETS

Arif Babul
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, V8P 1A1, Canada

Prateek Sharma
Department of Physics and Joint Astronomy Program, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, India

and

Christopher S. Reynolds
Department of Astronomy, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-2421, USA

Draft version September 27, 2012

ABSTRACT

AGN jets carry more than sufficient energy to stave off catastrophic cooling of the intracluster medium (ICM) in the cores of cool-core clusters. However, in order to prevent catastrophic cooling, the ICM must be heated in a near-isotropic fashion and narrow bipolar jets are inefficient at heating the gas in the transverse direction to the jets. We argue that due to existent conditions in cluster cores, the SMBHs will, in addition to accreting gas via radiatively inefficient flows, experience short stochastic episodes of enhanced accretion via thin discs. In general, the orientation of these accretion discs will be misaligned with the spin axis of the black holes and the ensuing torques will cause the black hole's spin axis (and therefore, the jet axis) to slew and rapidly change direction. This model not only explains recent observations showing successive generations of jet-lobes-bubbles in individual cool-core clusters that are offset from each other in the angular direction with respect to the cluster center, but also shows that AGN jets *can* heat the cluster core nearly isotropically on the gas cooling timescale. One implication of our proposed model is that since SMBHs that host thin accretion discs will manifest as quasars, we predicts that roughly 1–2 rich clusters within $z < 0.5$ should have quasars at their centers. Also, recurrent accretion via misaligned accretion discs implies that as a population, the SMBHs at the centers of cool-core clusters should be spinning slowly. Our model, in fact, requires SMBHs to be spinning slowly. Torques from misaligned discs are ineffective at tilting rapidly spinning black holes by more a few degrees whereas slowly spinning SMBHs can, under optimal conditions, slew by as much as $\sim 30^\circ$ during any one accretion event.

Subject headings: galaxies: clusters: general cooling flows galaxies: active - X-rays: galaxies: clusters

1. INTRODUCTION

The cool-core conundrum poses a critical challenge for theoretical models seeking to explain the observed properties of clusters of galaxies. The intracluster medium (ICM) in cool-core clusters should, according to simple theoretical arguments and direct observations of X-ray emission (Fabian et al. 1984), be cooling and dropping out at prodigious rates, yet only relatively meager amounts of cool and cold gas is seen in cluster centers. High resolution X-ray and radio observations of the cores of these clusters indicate that the dominant central galaxy (hereafter referred to as the BCG — the brightest cluster galaxy) invariably shows evidence of active galactic nuclei (AGN) behaviour, often in the form of powerful bipolar jets and pairs of approximately spherical depressions in the X-ray emissions, typically interpreted as being due to bubbles of relativistic plasma that have been inflated in the ICM by the jets. The inferred power of the jets is comparable to the radiative losses in the ICM and the case — based on theoretical arguments and observational inference — in favour of this radio-mode AGN energy injection into the ICM being the most likely explanation for the diminished cooling, is fairly robust (McNamara & Nulsen 2007). However, the precise manner in which this energy is injected into and distributed within the ICM remains an open question. The mechanics of how an apparently narrow bipolar outflow is able to heat the ICM in a near-isotropic fashion is particularly vexing(*c.f.* Vernaleo & Reynolds 2006) .

Recent detailed studies of individual cool core groups and clusters offer a clue to resolving this "isotropy" problem. Many of the systems show evidence of multiple generations of radio jets and cocoons as well as X-ray cavity pairs (cf McNamara et al. 2001; Dunn et al. 2006; Wise et al. 2007; Forman et al. 2007; Giacintucci et al. 2011; Randall et al. 2011; OSullivan et al. 2012). In a number of these systems (*e.g.* M87 [Virgo], NGC 1275 [Perseus], NGC 4636, NGC 5044, NGC 5813, Hydra A, MACS J0913.7+4056 [also known as CL09104+4109 and hereafter referred to as CL09]), successive generations of jet-lobe-bubbles are significantly offset from each other in the angular direction on the sky, with respect to the cluster center. If the AGN jet byproducts can trace a nearly isotropic angular distribution about the cluster center, then so should the associated heating. And if the timescale over which the jet axis changes direction is shorter than the cooling time, the isotropy problem is a non-issue. The question then is: What is the most likely explanation for the wandering nature of jet axis given the conditions in the cores of cool-core clusters?

babul@uvic.ca

Potential explanations can be classified into two broad categories: The first invoke interactions between the jet and the "ICM weather", *i.e.* large-scale[1] turbulence, wakes and bulk velocities induced by mergers and orbiting substructure (Heinz et al. 2006; Morsony et al. 2010). The simulation study by Morsony et al. (2010) illustrates that strong large-scale turbulent flows can result in large angular displacement of the low density jet material from the jet axis. Undoubtedly, jet-ICM interactions must be occurring at some level; however, there are a number of factors that suggest that its impact in cores of typical cool-core clusters is less than in the simulations. First, Morsony et al. (2010) only consider an unrelaxed cluster. However, the X-ray images of the core regions of most cool-core clusters do not typically show any evidence of disturbances associated with significant ongoing or recent mergers. According to detailed simulation studies of the impact of mergers on clusters cores (Poole et al. 2007), a cluster with a dynamically unrelaxed core and no other visible morphological merger signatures would need to have experienced a major merger (*i.e.* greater than a 1:3 mass ratio) within a relatively narrow window approximately $3.5-4$ Gyrs ago. It seems somewhat contrived to assert that all systems with offset jet-lobe-bubbles fall in this category. Moreover, comparative analyses of X-ray and lensing cluster data (*e.g.* Mahdavi et al. 2008; Zhang et al. 2010) indicate that the cluster cores are, by and large, dynamically relaxed. Additionally, while the simulations of Morsony et al. (2010) show that the direction of the high velocity jet flow on small scales is unaffected by turbulence, the jets in both Virgo and Perseus, for example, show evidence of change in orientation on subkiloparsec to kiloparsec scales (*c.f.* section 2, Table 1), as do the jets in a number of Seyfert galaxies (*c.f.* Gallimore et al. 2006, and references therein) and in CL09 (OSullivan et al. 2012). The latter system is particularly interesting in that there are clearly two very distinct jets: an older jet that stretches linearly out to scales of ~ 60 kpc on either side with no evidence of bends or distortions of the kind one would expect if there was significant turbulence in the ICM, and a second much smaller jet whose axis is offset from the first by $\sim 17°$.

The alternate class of models invoke changes in the orientation of the spin axis of the supermassive black holes (SMBHs) that are powering the jets. This explanation is premised on the understanding that (a) the angular position of any particular feature (jet/cavity/bubble) is indicative of the direction of the jet axis at the time when the feature was formed, and (b) the jet axis is always coincident with the black hole's spin axis. The spin orientation of black holes can change as a result of precession (*c.f.* Pizzolato & Soker 2005b; Lodato & Pringle 2006; Liu & Chen 2007; Campanelli et al. 2007a, and references therein), spin flips (*c.f.* Merritt & Ekers 2002; Campanelli et al. 2007b; Kesden et al. 2010, and references therein) or slewing (or tilting) of the black hole spin axis (*c.f.* Scheuer & Feiler 1996; King et al. 2005; Lodato & Pringle 2006). We will consider these option in more detail in section 2, after we review some of the most compelling observations of repeated re-orientation of the jet axes in galaxy groups and clusters. For now, we will simply note that the only two viable scenarios are: (a) precession associated with binary black hole systems in the cluster cores, or (b) stochastic slewing of the black hole spin axis due to torques from recurring, short-lived, misaligned thin discs. In this paper, we argue that the observations are best understood in the context of the latter model.

In the next section, we will first review the most compelling observational evidence for recurring reorientation of the jet axes in cluster environments. We then assess the various scenarios involving changes in the direction of the black hole's spin axis and identify those that are both plausible and compatible with the observations. In §3, we motivate the case for the our preferred model, which involves rapid, stochastic reorientations of the SMBH's spin axis on relatively short timescales, summarize the associated physics, and discuss why we expect this to be recurrent phenomenon in cores of cool-core clusters. In §4, we discuss the astrophysical implications of our model.

2. WANDERING JET AXIS: ASSESSING THE OBSERVATIONAL EVIDENCE

Observations of "Winged" and "X-shaped" radio galaxies (XRGs) (*c.f.* Hodges-Kluck et al. 2010, and references therein) and changes in the orientation of the jets on sub-kiloparsec scales in Seyfert galaxies (*c.f.* Gallimore et al. 2006, and references therein) have long hinted at the possibility that AGN jets undergo discreet changes in direction by large angles on relatively short (a few Myrs to several 10s of Myrs) timescales. However, recent radio and X-ray studies of AGN activity in cool-core groups and clusters offer arguably the most compelling evidence for "jet reorientation". This evidence is manifest in a variety of forms ranging from large-angle bends in the radio jets, to abrupt changes in direction from one jet episode to the next, to multiple generations of radio cocoons and X-ray cavities, some of which appear to trace out a nearly isotropic distribution in projection about the cluster center. Examples of such systems include CL09, M87 [Virgo], NGC 1275 [Perseus], NGC 4636, NGC 5044, NGC 5813, and Hydra A (Klein 1999; Dunn et al. 2006; Forman et al. 2007; Wise et al. 2007; Giacintucci et al. 2011; Randall et al. 2011; OSullivan et al. 2012).

In Table 1, we focus on the Virgo and the Perseus clusters, two systems that have been the subject of a detailed, multi-wavelength observational campaign over the course of the past decade, and catalogue most of the pertinent features seen in the radio and X-ray maps of these two systems typically associated with the radio-mode AGN activity of the central SMBH. Collectively, these observations of misaligned active and relic jets, as well as radio lobes, bubbles, and distinct X-ray cavities separated by large angles, strongly indicate that the underlying outflow responsible for forming these features changes direction between energetic jet "episodes" over timescales ranging from few Myrs to few 10s of Myrs. (Fig. 1 in Dunn et al. 2006 and Fig. 5 in Forman et al. 2007 show this visually.) On the sub-parsec and parsec scales, this is indicated by changes in the direction of the jets

---

[1] We use the label "large-scale" to distinguish between velocity fluctuations induced by mergers as opposed to "small-scale" turbulence generated by, for example, supernova blastwaves.

TABLE 1
Features Indicating Jet Reorientation in Perseus and Virgo

Feature	P.A. (North)^a	P.A. (South)^a	Timescale	Ref.	Comment
Perseus (NGC 1275, 3C 84)					
Milliarcsecond jet	—	$\sim 170^o$	—	1,2	Krichbaum et al. (1993) argue that the jet is nearly aligned with line of sight (los) very close to the core. On kpc scales, however, it is $\sim$ 45^o relative to los, implying a significant change in direction.
Cocoon-like feature at $r \sim$ 1.2 mas	—	$\sim 210^o$	—	1,2,3	
Parsec-scale cocoon at $r \sim$ 12 mas	$\sim 5^o - 10^o$	$\sim 180^o$	$\sim$ 25 yrs	1,3,4	
Inner bubble	$\sim 345^o$	$\sim 155^o$	$\sim$ 10 Myrs	5	Note that, unlike here, angles in Dunn et al. (2006) were measured in the clockwise direction.
Outer bubble	$\sim 5^o$	$\sim 215^o$	$\sim 15 - 20$ Myrs	5	
Ghost bubble	$\sim 305^o$	$\sim 170^o$	$\sim 70 - 75$ Myrs	5	Based on the shape of the northern bubble and the kinematics of the trailing Hα filaments, Dunn et al. (2006) argue that the bubble must be moving nearly perpendicular to the line of sight — in the plane of the sky.
Ancient bubble	$\sim 345^o$	$\sim 230^o$	$\sim$ 100 Myrs	5	
Virgo (M87, 3C 274)					
Jet	290^o	115^o	—	6, 7	Biretta et al. (1995) argue that from 0.1 to 1000 parsecs, the observed jet (stretching to the northwest) is aligned at $\sim$ 40^o to los. The counter jet is not observed but its direction is inferred from the location of the hot spot.
Inner lobes (in radio); jet/counter-jet cavities (in X-ray) at $\sim$ 2.5kpc	$270^o - 275^o$	$120^o - 130^o$	—	6, 7, 8	
Series of buoyant bubbles in the southeast	—	$160^o, 140^o, 120^o, 100^o$	$\langle \Delta t_{\rm age} \rangle \sim 6$ Myrs	8	Ordered from closest to furthest in projection
Intermediate East-West jets and lobes	270^o	90^o	$\sim$ 20 Myrs	9, 10	Following Klein (1999), we identity the Eastern radio arm (Feature C in Fig.3 of Owen et al. (2000)), terminating in the "ear-like Feature B, and the Western extension of the jet along with "knot D" as jet-lobe features. Klein (1999) refers to Features B and D as "intermediate lobes".
Outer X-ray cavity	$35^o - 40^o$		70 Myrs	8	This is the cavity discovered by Forman et al. (2007) and named "outer cavity".
Outer radio bubbles	10^o	205^o	100 Myrs	9, 10	

---

[a] P.A. is the angle in the sky at the source location between North and the feature, measured in the counterclockwise direction.

(1)Dhawan et al. (1998), (2) Lister (2001), (3) Krichbaum et al. (1993), (4) Nagai et al. (2009), (5) Dunn et al. (2006), (6) Biretta (1993), (7) Biretta et al. (1995), (8) Forman et al. (2007), (9)Owen et al. (2000), (10)Klein (1999) themselves, and on kiloparsec scales and beyond, several generations of radio bubbles/X-ray cavities are observed and their distribution covers almost all projected angles, with many cavity pairs orientated nearly collinear with the SMBH. These relative changes in the orientation of the jet-counterjet features are more consistent with rotation of the jet axis rather than displacement of the source, which would tend to generate wide-angle tail-like geometries (*e.g.* Jetha et al. 2008, and references therein).

Conceptually, the most obvious way to affect a change in the direction of the BH's spin axis is via accretion. Supermassive black holes in BCGs at the centers of cool core clusters are thought to be accreting gas from their surroundings via geometrically thick, radiatively inefficient flows at a relatively low rate $\dot{\rm M} < 10^{-3}\dot{\rm M}_{\rm Edd}$ (Allen et al. 2006), where

$$\dot{\rm M}_{\rm Edd} \equiv \frac{L_{\rm Edd}}{0.1c^2} \approx 25\ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}\ \ {\rm M}_\odot\ {\rm yr}^{-1}, \qquad (1)$$

is the Eddington mass accretion rate and $\rm M_{\bullet 9} \equiv (\ M_\bullet/10^9\ M_\odot)$ is the black hole mass in units of $10^9\ \rm M_\odot$. In the event that the angular momentum of the geometrically thick flow is misaligned with the direction of the BH's spin axis, the latter will gradually swivel and move to align with the former as BH accretes the gas and its angular momentum. The corresponding alignment timescale is comparable to the black hole's mass-doubling timescale ($\sim\ \rm M_\bullet/\dot{M}$). This timescale, however, is far too long to explain the observations: For a $10^9\ \rm M_\odot$ SMBH accreting at a rate $\dot{\rm M} \approx 0.01\ \rm M_\odot yr^{-1}$, the corresponding timescale is $\sim$ 100 Gyrs. Accretion via geometrically thick flow is not a viable option.

As noted previously, one way to effect a *rapid* change in the direction of an AGN's jet axis is via a spin-flip, which refers to the change in the direction of a black hole's spin axis as a result of a major BH-BH merger. However, spin-flip is an unlikely explanation for the observed features in Virgo and Perseus, for instance. One would need to invoke several BH-BH mergers over a duration of ~100 Myrs to account for the 5–7 episodes of changes in the direction of the jet axes over this period. This requirement, in and of itself, makes this scenario implausible. Additionally, BH-BH mergers typically result in progenitors with large recoil velocities (e.g., Campanelli et al. 2007a) whereas observations suggest that the origin point of the jets appears to be unchanging and coincident with the cluster/BCG center. Large recoil velocities can be avoided if the spins of all SMBHs involved are low. Alternatively, large recoil velocities can be avoided if the BHs' spins and the binary's orbital angular momentum are aligned prior to the merger; however, such alignments also preclude the possibility of large-angle spin flips (Bogdanović, Reynolds, & Miller 2007).

The observations can also be understood if the spin axis of the black hole is precessing about a fixed axis. A number of authors, including Klein (1999); Pizzolato & Soker (2005b); Dunn et al. (2006); Falceta-Goncalves et al. (2010) have invoked precession of the black hole spin axis to explain the distribution of radio and X-ray observations in Virgo and Perseus. Precession can occur if the black hole in question is part of a binary black hole system whose spins and the orbital angular momentum are misaligned. The precession timescale due to spin-orbit coupling of a binary black hole with both black holes of comparable mass is (Merritt & Milosavljevic 2005; Key & Cornish 2011)

$$t_{\rm BH,prec} \sim 2.4 \times 10^7\ {\rm yrs} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}}{1\ {\rm pc}}\right)^{5/2}\ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}{}^{-3/2}, \qquad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is the binary semi-major axis. The precession timescale is certainly compatible with the observations and it is not inconceivable that the BCGs in cluster cores host binary supermassive black hole systems since the BCGs are thought to have been built up via mergers, including those involving giant elliptical galaxies, at $z \lesssim 1$. Moreover, unless the binary SMBH are embedded in a massive, gaseous accretion disc, the lifetime of the binary will be more than long enough to allow for multiple precession cycles (Merritt & Milosavljevic 2005). However, given the conditions in cores of cool-core systems, we would expect that if one of the black holes is powering jets, the other ought to be too. There appears to be no evidence of dual jets in the cores of Perseus and Virgo, nor are we aware of any additional evidence suggesting the existence of binary supermassive black holes in either Perseus or Virgo (or in most cool core clusters, for that matter). We also note that multiple re-orientations cannot be straightforwardly modeled as a periodic phenomenon, a characteristic that poses a challenge for the precession model (Dunn et al. 2006).

Precession can also occur if the black hole is surrounded by a geometrically-thin accretion disc whose angular momentum is misaligned with the spin axis of the black hole. A number of authors (e.g. Klein 1999; Falceta-Goncalves et al. 2010) invoke a misaligned accretion disc as an explanation for the changing jet directions in Perseus and Virgo. This scenario, however, is problematic for a number of reasons: First, as we noted above, precession is a periodic phenomenon and the observed re-orientations are not. Second, as Dunn et al. (2006) and Falceta-Goncalves et al. (2010) find, the Perseus observations can only be understood if the black hole precession angle is large and the BH undergoes several precession cycles over the course of ~100 Myrs. If the precession is disc-induced, this presupposes the existence of a large, stable, warped, geometrically thin accretion disc over the course of the past ~ 100 Myrs. AGNs with geometrically thin accretion discs are, however, expected to shine as quasars. The central AGNs in Virgo and Perseus do not appear to be quasars and neither are the AGNs in vast majority of cool-core clusters. More importantly, as emphasized by Lodato & Pringle (2006) and discussed more fully in section 3, a misaligned accretion disc will not only induce precessional torques on the SMBH; it will also induce torques that will cause the black hole spin axis to slew and move towards alignment with the total angular momentum of the black hole+disc system (see also Natarajan & Pringle 1998). Once the alignment is achieved, precession ceases. Correspondingly, a BH will typically *only undergo at the most one precession cycle.*

The possibility that a misaligned accretion disc can cause a black hole's spin axis to tilt on timescales of tens of Myrs (Scheuer & Feiler 1996; Natarajan & Pringle 1998; Lodato & Pringle 2006) forms the basis of our proposed model. Specifically, we argue that while AGNs at the center of cool-core clusters typically accrete gas at a relatively low rate via radiatively inefficient, geometrically thick flows , every so often the mass accretion rate will spike and give rise to short-lived, geometrically thin accretion discs. In order to account for the observations, we require that the angular momentum vector of these recurring discs is generally *not* aligned with the direction of the SMBH's spin. These recurring misaligned thin discs are the central to our model because only geometrically thin structures can cause the BH to slew rapidly; geometrically thick flows do not appear to have the same effect on the SMBH (King et al. 2005; Fragile et al. 2007; Dexter & Fragile 2011).

3. TITLING SUPERMASSIVE BLACK HOLES

There are a number of questions to address in the context of our "misaligned accretion disc" model is: Do the existent conditions at the centers of cool-core clusters allow for the recurring formation of geometrically thin accretion discs? Are these discs likely to be massive enough to cause the SMBH's spin axis to change direction significantly on short timescales?

3.1. *Recurring, Short-lived High Accretion Events in Cool-Core Environments*

Apart from the hot diffuse gas, central regions of BCGs in cool-core clusters also appear to be threaded by a filamentary network of cold gas (*c.f.* M87 [Virgo] Forman et al. (2007); CL09 OSullivan et al. (2012, and references therein); NGC 4696 [Centaurus] Crawford et al. (2005); NGC 1275 [Perseus] Conselice et al. (2001)) that generally appear to cover a significant fraction of the 4π steradian about the cluster center. Increasingly detailed kinematical studies of the filaments suggest that these likely have their origins in number of different physical mechanisms. Many of these mechanisms will also induce short-lived accretion events during which the instantaneous mass accretion rate onto the central SMBH can exceed $0.01\dot{\rm M}_{\rm Edd}$, the threshold accretion rate above which the geometrically thick, radiatively inefficient flow is expected to transition to a geometrically thin, disc flow (Esin, McClintock & Narayan 1997; Jester 2005). Here we briefly review the three likely mechanisms: bubble wakes (Hatch et al. 2006; Pope et al. 2010), thermal instabilities (Pizzolato & Soker 2005a; McCourt et al. 2012; Sharma et al. 2012), and convergent small-scale turbulent flows (Hobbs et al. 2011).

Pope et al. (2010) present a detailed description of the mechanisms by which buoyantly-rising jet-inflated bubbles transport cool gas out of the BCG cores as they detach and start to rise, along with the properties of the "cool wake". For quasi-spherical bubbles of the type typically seen in the X-ray observations, this wake is expected to involve $\sim 10^8$ $\rm M_\odot$ of cool gas per bubble. The trails of cool gas behind the rising bubbles can stretch for several tens of kiloparsecs, with filamentary material close to the bubble traveling with the bubble, and away from the cluster centre, and the material further down the filament (and closer to the cluster centre) falling back towards the cluster centre. Given this kinematic profile, it is expected that every so often fragments of cool gas ($M \sim 10^5$–10^7 $\rm M_\odot$) will break away from the filamentary wakes and drip onto the BH. Since the filaments are primarily radial in orientation, we expect that the fragments will have intrinsically low angular momentum relative to the SMBH and hence, ultimately settle into a subparsec-scale accretion disc. The angular momentum of the wake (and therefore, the alignment of the accretion disc that forms from material breaking off from this wake) will be more or less perpendicular to the black hole's spin/jet axis because the bubbles are inflated along the axis of the jet that created them and buoyantly rise radially outward. Anticipating the discussion below, each jet/bubble outburst in effect sets into motion a chain of events that result in the reorientation of the BH's spin axis and hence, the direction of the jet.

In the case of turbulent gas, Hobbs et al. (2011) focus on the formation and evolution of dense, low-angular momentum, filaments created by convergent turbulent flows. In their simulations, they find that such filaments involve only a small fraction of the total available gas. They find that these streams fall "ballistically" onto the SMBH, where the gas is presumed to settle into a subparsec scale accretion discs. Translating the angular momentum of individual filaments crossing the lower boundary of their simulations into an orientation vector for the accretion disc, the Hobbs et al. (2011) results suggest that not only are successive disc orientations uncorrelated, they can be offset by large angles. Hobbs et al. (2011) do not compute the mass spectrum of these accretion events nor do they estimate the frequency. We note that their simulations do not include self-gravity, cooling, star formation and stellar feedback, which may explain why the filaments do not fragment into clouds. Typically, one would expect turbulence to give rise to clouds with mass spectrum (Hopkins, Quataert & Murray 2012)

$$dN_{\rm cl} \propto M_{\rm cl}^{-1.8}\ dM_{\rm cl}, \qquad M_{\rm cl} \lesssim f_{\rm gas}^2 M_{\rm gas}(<R), \tag{3}$$

where $f_{\rm gas}$ is the fraction of gas mass relative to the *total* enclosed mass. The typical mass of cold gas in cool-core cluster BCGs is $\sim$ a few $\times 10^{10}$ $\rm M_\odot$ within the central 10 kpc (Edge 2001; Salome & Combes 2003; Edge et a. 2010), which corresponds to $f_{\rm gas} \sim 0.1$. In this case, the number of clouds with mass $M_{\rm cl} \gtrsim 10^6$ $\rm M_\odot$ is $\sim$2,500. (We choose this mass threshold because less massive clouds have negligible impact on the SMBH; we discuss this further in §3.2 below.) Only a fraction of these clouds, with specific angular momentum small enough such that the circularization radius is ~ 0.1 pc, will give rise to accretion discs. Assuming that the velocity distribution of the clouds is isotropic, with velocity dispersion $\sigma_{\rm cl} \approx 300$ km/s, and that the radial distribution of the clouds is approximately isothermal ($n_{\rm cl} \propto r^{-2}$), the mean time between accretion events is $\sim$ a few $\times 10^7$ yrs.

Recent numerical simulation studies show that thermal instabilities (Sharma et al. 2010; McCourt et al. 2012; Sharma et al. 2012), as well as small-scale supersonic turbulence — induced, for example, by supernova blastwaves (Hobbs et al. 2011) associated with star formation in the central regions of the BCGs (*e.g.* Bildfell et al. 2008) — can also give rise to gaseous streams and high density clouds. The fraction of these structures with low angular momentum will rain down upon the AGN giving rise to stochastic events of enhanced accretion that can approach the Eddington rate for short periods (e.g., Sharma et al. 2012; Gaspari et al. 2012;

Hobbs et al. 2011). Within the thermal equilibrium model for cool cores (Sharma et al. 2012), the occurrence of cold filaments and blobs depends on the feedback heating efficiency (Fig. 11 in Sharma et al. 2012). If the efficiency is high, the core reaches equilibrium at low densities and will not be prone to forming thermal instabilities. At low efficiencies, however, cold gas is present most of the time. In general, we expect the gas in the cores of cool core clusters to undergo distinct cooling "events" separated by several core cooling times (*i.e.* a few 100 Myrs). However, an individual cooling "event" will spawn multiple cold blobs with slightly different angular momenta, which will give rise to closely spaced accretion events, and therefore BH realignments, with time lags $\sim 10^6 - 10^7$ years, *i.e.* , of order the free-fall time. These can explain angular offsets between bubbles/cavities separated by $\lesssim 100$ Myr in age.

3.2. *Misaligned accretion discs and spinning black holes*

Given an accretion disc whose initial rotational axis is misaligned with the spin axis of the black hole, frame dragging by the rotating black hole will induce a torque on the inner regions of the disc that will cause it to precess differentially, an effect known as Lense-Thirring precession. Bardeen & Petterson (1975) showed that the viscous forces in the disc will damp the differential precession, and force the angular momenta of the disc to align[2] with the total angular momentum of the system (King et al. 2005; Lodato & Pringle 2006). The alignment of the disc proceeds from inside out, with the transition radius between the inner disc and the outer disc demarcated by a warp. Since the process is primarily driven by frame-dragging, the influence of which falls off rapidly with distance, the warp will not propagate out across the entire disc. Instead it will stall at a radius $R_{\rm w}$, where the rate at which the disc is twisted by Lense-Thirring precession is balanced by the rate at which viscous torques can dissipate the twist (Scheuer & Feiler 1996; King et al. 2005; Lodato & Pringle 2006). The warp radius is given by (see Eq. 22 in King et al. 2005)

$$R_{\rm w} \approx 2.6{\times}10^{-3}\, j_{0.1}^{5/8}\, \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{-1/4}\ \ {\rm M_{\bullet}}_{9}^{9/8} \times \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{3}\right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\alpha_2/\alpha_1}{30}\right)^{-1/8}\ {\rm pc}, \qquad (4)$$

where $\dot{\rm M}_{0.04} \equiv (\dot{\rm M}/0.04\dot{\rm M}_{\rm Edd})$ and $j_{0.1} \equiv (j/0.1)$. Here, j is the black hole spin parameter scaled to $J_{\bullet,max} = (G\,{\rm M_{\bullet}}^2/c)$, the maximum angular momentum of a Kerr black hole: $0 \leq j \leq 1$. King and collaborators have argued in a series of related articles (*c.f.* King et al. 2008, and references therein) that if BHs grow primarily via recurrent randomly orientated accretion events, they will tend to have low spins. For this reason, we have chosen to scale j to a fiducial value of 0.1. Also, α_1 in the above relationship is the Shakura & Sunyaev (1973) viscosity parameter characterizing the radially outward transport of gas angular momentum and inward transport of matter flow, and α_2 is the viscosity associated with vertical motions in the disc. For the purposes at hand, we assume that over the regions of interest, the α_1 parameter (the usual accretion disc α parameter) is approximately constant and adopt $\alpha_1 \approx 0.1$ as a fiducial value. This is consistent with results from MHD simulations of magnetized accretion flows, which find that the effective value of α_1 is ~ 0.1 over the bulk of the flow (e.g., Hawley & Krolik 2001, 2002). Moreover, Lodato & Price (2010) show that for a strongly warped disc, $\alpha_2 \sim 3$. For discs with $\alpha_1 > H/R$, which should hold true for thin disc accretion, the warp will propagate through the disc diffusively on timescale α_2/α_1 shorter than the mass accretion timescale, which is determined solely by α_1. Finally, we note that we have scaled the mass accretion rate to $0.04\dot{\rm M}_{\rm Edd}$, which corresponds to $1\ {\rm M_{\odot} yr^{-1}}$ for a $10^9\ {\rm M_{\odot}}$.

The disc is not the only structure to experience a torque. The black hole too will experience equal and opposite torques exerted by each differentially precessing disc annulus, which in turn cause the black hole's spin axis to change direction. In the case of a disc whose outer radius is less than $R_{\rm w}$, the torques on the black hole will exist for only a very short time while the warp expands out across the disc; such discs do not impact the black hole in any significant fashion. For this reason, we will restrict ourselves to discs whose radius extends beyond R_{rmw}. In such cases, the torques on the black hole is primarily due to the gas flowing through the warp (King et al. 2008). These torques can be resolved into two independent components: one that drives the precession of the hole's spin about the total angular momentum axis of the disc+BH system and another that drives the alignment of the black hole's spin with the total angular momentum. Lodato & Pringle (2006) and Martin et al. (2007) have investigated these two processes in detail and find that the BH precession timescale is comparable to, and in realistic cases perhaps even a factor of a few longer (Martin et al. 2007) than, the timescale over which the black hole's spin will align with the total angular momentum of the BH+disc system: *i.e.* , $t_{\rm BH,prec} \gtrsim t_{\rm align}$, where the black hole alignment timescale (Eq. 15 in Lodato & Pringle 2006; see also Scheuer & Feiler 1996; Natarajan & Pringle 1998):

$$t_{\rm align} \approx 2.0 \times 10^6\, j_{0.1}^{11/16}\, \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{-7/8}\ \ {\rm M_{\bullet}}_{9}^{-1/16} \times \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{3}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\alpha_2/\alpha_1}{30}\right)^{-15/16}\ {\rm yrs}. \qquad (5)$$

Consequently, the black hole is unlikely to execute more than one precession cycle, if that, and once alignment is achieved, the torques driving the precession vanish as well.

Whether the BH attains full alignment during a given accretion event depends on the size (mass) of the accretion disc. The disc must be sufficiently long-lived to sustain gas flow (and therefore, the torques) over the duration $t_{\rm align}$. In other words,

$$M_{\rm d,align} \gtrsim 2.0 \times 10^6\, j_{0.1}^{11/16}\, \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{1/8}\ \ {\rm M_{\bullet}}_{9}^{15/16} \times \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{3}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\alpha_2/\alpha_1}{30}\right)^{-15/16}\ {\rm M_{\odot}}. \qquad (6)$$

In general, the above scenario for the slewing of the

---

[2] Here, we use the term "align" loosely to refer to either co-alignment or counter-alignment. Details of how the disc orientation evolves is immaterial to the present discussion. What is important is that the gas is subject to torques that drives a change in its orientation.

BH's spin axis does not require the BH to achieve full alignment with the total angular momentum during each and every accretion event, only that the BH's spin axis change direction. However, as we discuss below, tilts induced by discs with $M_{\rm d} \lesssim 10^6\ \ {\rm M}_\odot$ are too small to be of interest.

At the same time, the amount of gas that a black hole can accrete in the thin-disc mode during any one accretion episode cannot be arbitrarily large regardless of the amount of gas that is channeled into the nuclear region during the event. This upper bound arises because accretion discs are susceptible to gravitational fragmentation beyond a radius $R_{\rm frag}$ where the disc mass exceeds (*c.f.* Goodman 2003; Thompson et al. 2005; King & Pringle 2007; King et al. 2008, and references therein)

$$M_{\rm d}(< R_{\rm frag}) = f\ \left(\frac{H}{R}\right)\ {\rm M}_\bullet, \tag{7}$$

where the factor, $f\ \sim$ a few, represents the uncertainty in this relationship due poorly understood details such as the extent to which the magnetic pressure, radiation pressure and stellar feedback augments thermal pressure due to viscous heating and contributes to the stability of the disc. Adopting a simple model of Collin-Souffrin & Dumont (1990) to describe the properties of the sub-parsec-scale thin accretion disc (see also King et al. 2008)[3], the total disc mass inside radius R, where R denotes the distance from the BH, is

$$M_{\rm d} \approx 3.1{\times}10^6\ \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{3/5}\ \ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}^{4/5}\ \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{0.1}\right)^{-4/5} R_{0.05}^{7/5}\ {\rm M}_\odot, \tag{8}$$

and the accretion disc scale height H is

$$\frac{H}{R} \approx 1.6\times10^{-3}\ \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{1/5}\ \ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}^{-3/20}\ \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{0.1}\right)^{-1/10}\ R_{0.05}^{1/20}. \tag{9}$$

Here, $R_{0.05} \equiv (R/0.05\,{\rm pc})$. Using these equations, we find that

$$R_{\rm frag} \approx 0.1\ f_5^{20/27}\ \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{-8/27}\ \ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}^{1/27}\ \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{0.1}\right)^{14/27}\ {\rm pc}. \tag{10}$$

Here, $f_5 = (f/5)$. Most of the gas at $R > R_{\rm frag}$ is expected to either turn into stars or be expelled by stars that do form on timescales much shorter than those that govern the accretion flow. Since only gas that flows through the warp induces a torque on the black hole (King et al. 2008), this means that the maximum amount of mass that can participate in the alignment process is

$$M_{\rm d,max} \approx 7.4{\times}10^6\ f_5^{28/27}\ \dot{\rm M}_{0.04}^{5/27} \times\ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}^{23/27}\ \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{0.1}\right)^{-2/27}\ {\rm M}_\odot. \tag{11}$$

Finally, we can estimate the maximum angle $\psi_{\rm max}$ through which the black hole's spin axis will slew during any one accretion event where the initial misalignment between the disc angular momentum and the black hole spin vector is characterized by angle θ_i. Following King et al. (2008), we identity $J_{\rm d}$, the "disc angular momentum", as the total angular momentum of the gas flowing through the warp. Consequently, if $\Delta M_{\rm gas}$ is the total gas mass that flows through the warp during an accretion event, then

$$J_{\rm d} = (G\ {\rm M}_\bullet\ R_{\rm w})^{1/2}\ \left(\Delta M_{\rm gas}\right), \tag{12}$$

where $\Delta M_{\rm gas} \leq M_{\rm d,max}$. Straightfoward geometry then gives

$$\sin\psi_{\rm max} = \frac{J_{\rm d}}{J_{\rm h}}\sin(\theta_i - \psi_{\rm max}). \tag{13}$$

The above equation differs slightly from that given by King et al. (2008) because the latter's derivation implicitly assumes that $\psi_{\rm max} \ll 1$. The extent of the tilt induced by an accretion disc depends on the initial misalignment between the disc's angular momentum and the BH's spin axis as well as on the ratio

$$\frac{J_{\rm d}}{J_{\rm h}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{j}\ \left(\frac{\Delta M_{\rm gas}}{{\rm M}_\bullet}\right)\left(\frac{R_{\rm w}}{R_S}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{14}$$

where $R_S\ \equiv\ 2GM/c^2\ \approx\ 10^{-4}\ \ \ {\rm M}_{\bullet 9}$ pc is the Schwarzschild radius. To effect a tilt of $\sim 5^\circ$ in the spin axis of a slowly spinning (*i.e.* $j \simeq 0.1$) SMBH, the minimum amount of gas required is $\Delta M_{\rm gas} \simeq 10^6\ \ {\rm M}_\odot$. A maximal disc, *i.e.* $\Delta M_{\rm gas} \simeq M_{\rm d,max}$, can tilt a a slowly rotating SMBH by as much as $\sim 30^\circ$. For completeness, we note that rapidly spinning black holes (*i.e.* $j \simeq 0.9$) are much harder to tilt. A maximal disc can tilt a rapidly spinning ($j \simeq 0.9$) supermassive black hole by, at the most, $\sim 7^\circ$.

4. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND SUMMARY

To recap, supermassive black holes at the centers of cool-core clusters will, in addition of the accretion of hot diffuse gas from its surroundings, experience short-lived, recurring episodes during which the instantaneous mass accretion rate onto the central SMBH can approach $\sim 1\ {\rm M}_\odot\ {\rm yr}^{-1}$. We expect this phenomena to be ubiquitous; it is a byproduct of a number of very different and distinct physical processes expected to be operating in cores of cool-core clusters. During such episodes, the flow in the immediate vicinity of the black hole will transition to a geometrically thin flow and establish an accretion disc.

Current generation of simulation studies looking at the wide variety of processes at play in cool cluster cores are not detailed enough to provide a full statistical characterization of the spectrum of gas mass involved in individual high density accretion events, the distribution of the time between accretion spikes, or the direction of the rotation vector of the resultant accretion disc relative to the spin axis of the SMBH. Nonetheless, the simulations do suggest that all of these will vary stochastically from event to event and specifically, the orientations of successive discs will be uncorrelated. Simulations as well as theoretical estimates also suggest that individual accretion events will involve 10^5–10^7 ${\rm M}_\odot$ and that the average time between the events is ~ 10 Myrs, with the caveat that the time between pairs of consecutive events can vary widely. This timescale is in agreement with that implied by the history of AGN activity in Perseus and Virgo, as summarized in Table 1: Perseus and Virgo data both suggest ~ 5 events over the past 10^8 years.

---

[3] This is a model of a flat steady-state disc and we acknowledge that a flat disc and a warped disc are unlikely to have identical structures. The use of this model is a necessary simplification in order to estimate relevant disc mass and length scales. We note, for completeness, that the scaling properties of this disc model are similar to that derived by Shakura & Sunyaev (1973).

When an accretion event gives rise to an accretion disc whose orientation is misaligned with the spin axis of the black hole, the resulting torques between the gas flowing through the disc and the black hole will cause the latter's axis to swivel and change direction. During any one event, the magnitude of the change in the direction of the BH's spin axis depends on the degree of the initial misalignment between the disc's angular momentum and the BH's spin axis, the magnitude of the disc angular momentum, and the magnitude of the SMBH's spin angular momentum. We find that under optimal conditions, a slowly rotating SMBH's spin axis can slew by as much as $\sim 30°$. In general, the direction of the spin axis after an accretion event will be uncorrelated with the direction of the old spin axis and over the course of many such events, the orientation of the black hole's spin axis will execute a random-walk over 4π steradian.

Drawing on the considerable body of work indicating that jet production is most efficient when the accretion flow is geometrically thick and suppressed otherwise (Livio et al. 1999; Meier 2001) (*c.f.* also Benson & Babul 2009, and references therein), we expect that the jets will briefly wane in power during the thin disc phase.[4] But once the accretion disc drains away and the geometrically thick flow re-establishes, the jets will also resume. Since the jet axis is the same as the spin axis, the post-tilt jets will point in a different direction from the pre-tilt jets. This scenario offers the simplest explanation of, for example, the apparently abrupt change in direction between an older (larger) relic jet in CL09 and a subsequent jet episode (OSullivan et al. 2012).

The mechanism/model outlined in this paper and summarized above has a number of important astrophysical implications:

- The recurring reorientation of AGN jets due to tilting of the SMBH spin axis will naturally give rise to distinct, randomly oriented jets/lobes/cavities observed in cool-core clusters such as Perseus, Virgo and CL09.

- If the jets typically change directions several times over the cooling time in cores of cool-core clusters — as we expect them to, since the latter is typically a ~ 100 Myrs — the resultant heating will, like the cavities and bubbles, also be distributed over a large portion of 4π steradians. We suggest that this process plays a significant role in the resolution of the "isotropic heating" puzzle.

- Since geometrically thin accretion discs are radiatively efficient, our model predicts that whenever one forms, the host AGN ought to transform into a quasar. The quasar will be short-lived because the discs do not involve a lot of mass and are expected to drain quickly. We can estimate the likelihood of catching an AGN "in the act" as follows: The Perseus and Virgo data both suggest ~ 5 events over the past 10^8 yrs. Assuming that a typical accretion event involves $\sim 10^6\ \mathrm{M}_\odot$ of gas and that the lifetime of the resulting disc is $\sim$ Myrs, we expect a quasar duty cycle of $\sim 5\%$. The rest of the time, the AGNs will be observed in the radio-mode, driving jets. The number of rich clusters ($T_x > 2$ keV) within $z = 0.5$ that have X-ray observations is ~ 250. Approximately 35% of rich clusters (Eckert, Molendi & Paltani 2011) tend to be strong cool core systems and of these, 35% show evidence of significant multiphase gas component in their cores (McDonald et al. 2010). Combining these, we would expect 1–2 of the $z < 0.5$ rich clusters to be in the quasar phase. In fact, there are two: MACS J0913.7+4056 [also known as CL09104+4109] (OSullivan et al. 2012) at $z = 0.44$ which hosts a dust enshrouded type 2 QSO at its centre, and a $z = 0.3$ cluster that hosts a highly luminous radio-quiet quasar, H1821+643 (Russell et al. 2010). Both quasars are located at the centres of cool-core clusters.

- The manner in which SMBHs acquire most of their mass has an important bearing on their spin distribution (*c.f.* Berti & Volonteri 2008; Fanidakis et al. 2011) and in turn, on their jet efficiencies (*c.f.* Nemmen et al. 2007; Benson & Babul 2009). If BHs grow primarily via recurrent accretion events of random angular momenta, then as King and collaborators have argued in a series of related articles (*c.f.* King et al. 2008, and references therein), they will tend to have low spins. The alternative model assumes the black holes grow via coherent accretion flows (*e.g.* Volonteri et al. 2005) and predicts that the bulk of the SMBHs are rapidly rotating, with $j \approx 0.9$ when the effects of the jets are taken into account (Benson & Babul 2009). However, even in such models, once the host dark matter halo of the SMBH grows to cluster-scale, *i.e.* 10^{14}–$10^{15}\ \mathrm{M}_\odot$, and the system itself evolves into a cool core cluster of the kind discussed in this paper, the subsequent evolution of the SMBH ought to be dominated by discreet stochastic accretion events. Vikhlinin et al. (2007), having found a sharp decline in the number of cool core clusters at $z > 0.5$ within sample of X-ray selected clusters, suggest that cool-core clusters are a relatively recent phenomenon. Assuming that this is true and that these systems formed about 5 Gyrs ago, that the mean accretion rate over this period is comparable to that suggested by the Perseus and Virgo data, and that typical accretion events involve $\sim 10^6\ \mathrm{M}_\odot$ of gas, we find that the total gas mass accreted via the stochastic process is $\Delta M_{\mathrm{gas,acc}} \sim 2.5 \times 10^8\ \mathrm{M}_\odot$, which is a substantial fraction of a SMBH's mass. This, in turn, suggests that the SMBHs at the centres of cool-core clusters ought to be slow rotators. If the cool core clusters are older than 5 Gyrs, as suggested by recent SZ detections of cool-core clusters at high z (Semler et al. 2012), the case for slowly spinning SMBHs is even stronger.

---

[4] This statement should not be interpreted as our suggesting that jet activity cannot arise during the quasar phase. We appreciate that at sufficiently high mass accretion rate, the flow should be able to sustain both behaviours. However, we do not expect such configurations to be common in cluster environments.

- Finally, we note that slowly rotating SMBHs are not only the result of the model described in this paper, our model requires SMBHs at the centers of cool-core clusters to be slowly rotating in order to explain the observed angular offsets between successive generations of jet-lobe-bubbles. If SMBHs *in such environments* are shown to be spinning rapidly, our proposed mechanism cannot explain these observations. Thin discs of the kind described in this paper cannot tilt rapidly spinning SMBHs by more than a few degrees.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge the hospitality of the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics at the University of California Santa Barbara where this work was conceived. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY05-51164 to KITP. AB acknowledge support from NSERC Canada through the Discovery Grant program and CSR acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation under Grant No. AST0908212. The authors would also like to thank P. Ajith, A. Benson, F. Durier and G. Novak for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

Allen, S. W., Dunn, R. J. H., Fabian, A. C., Taylor, G. B., & Reynolds, C. S. 2006, MNRAS, 372, 21
Bardeen, J. M., & Petterson, J. A. 1975, ApJ, 195, L65
Benson, A. J., Babul, A. 2009, MNRAS, 397, 1302
Bildfell, C., Hoekstra, H., Babul, A., Mahdavi, A., 2008, MNRAS, 389, 1637
Biretta, J. A., Zhou, F., & Owen, F. N. 1995, ApJ, 447, 582
Biretta, J. 1993, in *Astrophysical Jets*, Space Telescope Science Institute Symposium Series, Volume 6, eds. D. Burgarella, M. Livio, C. P. O'Dea (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press), 263
Bogdanović, T., Reynolds, C. S., Miller, M. C. 2007, ApJ, L147
Campanelli, M., Lousto, C. O., Zlochower, Y., Krishnan, B., & Merritt, D. 2007a, Phys. Rev. D, 75, 064030
Campanelli, M., Lousto, C., Zlochower, Y, & Merritt, D. 2007b, ApJ, 659, L5
Collin-Souffrin, S., Dumont, A.M., 1990, A&A, 229, 292
Conselice, C. J., Gallagher, S. J., Wyse, R. F. G. 2001, ApJ, 122, 2281.
Crawford, C. S., Hatch, N. A., Fabian, A. C. & Sanders, J. S. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 216.
Dexter, J., & Fragile, P. C. 2011, ApJ, 730, 36
Dhawan, V., Kellermann, K. I., & Romney, J. D. 1998, ApJ, 498, L111
Dunn, R. J. H., Fabian, A. C., & Sanders, J. S., 2006, MNRAS, 366, 758
Eckert, D., Molendi, S. & Paltani, S., 2011, A&A, 526, A79
Edge, A.C., 2001, MNRAS, 328, 762
Edge, A.C. et al., 2010, A&A, 518, L46
Esin A. A., McClintock J. E., Narayan R., 1997, ApJ, 489, 865
Fabian, A. C., Nulsen, P. E. J., Canizares, C. R. 1984, Nature, 310, 733
Falceta-Goncalves, D., Caproni, A., Abraham, Z., Teixeira, D. M., de Gouveia Dal Pino, E. M., 2010, ApJ, 713, L74.
Fanidakis, N., Baugh, C. M., Benson, A. J., et al. 2011, MNRAS, 410, 53
Fragile, P. C., Blaes, O. M., Anninos, P., & Salmonson, J. D. 2007, ApJ, 668, 417
Forman, W., et al. 2007, ApJ, 665, 1057
Gallimore, J. F., Axon, D. J., O'Dea, C. P., Baum, S. A., & Pedlar, A. 2006, AJ, 132, 546
Gaspari, M., Ruszkowski, M., & Sharma, P. 2012, ApJ, 746, 94
Giacintucci, S., et al. 2011 ApJ, 732, 95
Goodman, J. 2003, MNRAS, 339, 937.
Hatch N. A., Crawford C. S., Johnstone R. M. & Fabian A. C. 2006, MNRAS, 367, 433.
Hawley, J. F., Krolik, J. H. 2001, ApJ, 548, 348
Hawley, J. F., Krolik, J. H. 2002, ApJ, 566, 164
Heinz, S., Brggen, M., Young, A. & Levesque, E. 2006, MNRAS, 373, L65.
Hobbs, A., Nayakshin, S., Power, C., & King, A. 2011, MNRAS, 413, 2633
Hodges-Kluck, E. J., Reynolds, C. S., Miller, M. C., & Cheung, C. C. 2010, ApJ, 717, L37
Hopkins, P.F., Quataert, E. Murray, N. 2012, MNRAS, 421, 3488.
Jester, S. 2005, ApJ625, 667.
Jetha, N.N., Hardcastle, M.J., Babul, A., O'Sullivan, E., Ponman, T. J., Raychaudhury, S. and Vrtilek, J. (2008), MNRAS, 384, 1344
Kesden, M., Sperhake, U., Berti, E., 2010, Phys Rev D, 81, 084054
Key, J.S., Cornish, N.J., Phys. Rev. D 83, 083001
King, A. R., Lubow, S. H., Ogilvie, G. I., & Pringle, J. E. 2005, MNRAS, 363, 49
King, A. R., Pringle, J. E. 2007, MNRAS, 377, L25
King, A. R., Pringle, J. E., & Hofmann, J. A. 2008, MNRAS, 385, 1621
Klein, U. 1999, in *The Radio Galaxy Messier 87*, Proceedings of a workshop held at Ringberg Castle, Tegernsee, Germany, eds. H.-J. Rser, K. Meisenheimer (Berlin, New York: Springer), 56
Krichbaum, T. P., et al. 1993, A&A, 275, 375
Lister, M. L. 2001, ApJ, 562, 208
Lodato, G., Price, D.J., 2010, MNRAS, 405, 1212
Lodato, G., Pringle, J.E., 2006, MNRAS, 368, 1196
Liu, F.K., Chen, X., 2007, ApJ, 671, 1272
Livio, M., Ogilvie, G. I., & Pringle, J. E. 1999, ApJ, 512, 100
Mahdavi, A., Hoekstra, H., Babul, A., & Henry, J. P. 2008, MNRAS, 384, 1567
Martin, R. G., Pringle, J. E. & Tout, C. A. 2007, MNRAS, 381, 1617.
McCourt, M. Sharma, P., Quataert, E., & Parrish, I. J. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 3319
McDonald, M. et al. 2010, ApJ, 721, 1262
McNamara, B. R. et al. 2001, ApJ, 562, L149
McNamara, B. R. & Nulsen, P. E. J. 2007, ARA&A, 45, 117
Meier D. L., 2001, ApJ, 548, L9
Merritt, D. & Ekers, R. D. 2002, Science, 297, 1310
Merritt, D. & Milosavljevic, A., 2005, Living Rev. Relativity 8, 8. URL (cited on January 21st, 2012): http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2005-8
Morsony, B. J., Heinz, S., Brggen, M. & Ruszkowski, M. 2010, MNRAS, 407, 1277.
Nagai, H., Asada, K., Doi, A., Kameno, S., & Inoue, M. 2009, in *Approaching Micro-Arcsecond Resolution with VSOP-2: Astrophysics and Technologies*, ASP Conference Series, Vol. 402, eds. Y. Hagiwara, E. Fomalont, M. Tsuboi, Y. Murata., 106
Natarajan, P., & Pringle, J. E. 1998, ApJ, 506, L97
Nemmen R. S., Bower R. G., Babul A., Storchi-Bergmann T., 2007, MNRAS, 377, 1652
OSullivan, E., Giacintucci, S., Babul, A., Raychaudhury, S., Venturi, T., Bildfell, C., Mahdavi, A., Oonk, J.B.R., Murray, N., Hoekstra, H., Donahue, M., 2012, MNRAS, accepted for publication (arXiv:1206.1525)
Owen, F. N., Eilek, J. A., & Kassim, N. E. 2000, ApJ, 543, 611
Pizzolato, F. & Soker, N. 2005, ApJ, 632, 821
Pizzolato, F. & Soker, N. 2005, Adv. Space Res., 36, 762
Poole, G. B., Babul, A., McCarthy, I. G., Fardal, M. A., Bildfell, C. J., Quinn, T., & Mahdavi, A. 2007, MNRAS, 380, 437
Pope, E. C. D., Babul, A., Pavlovski, G., Bower, R. G. and Dotter, A. 2010, MNRAS, 406, 2023
Randall, S. W. et al. 2011, ApJ, 726, 86
Russell, H. R. et al. 2010, MNRAS, 402, 156
Salome, P., Combes, F., 2003, A&A, 412, 657
Semler, D. R., Šuhada, R., Aird, K. A., et al. 2012, arXiv:1208.3368
Scheuer, P. A. G. & Feiler, R. 1996, MNRAS, 282, 291

Shakura, N. I. & Sunyaev, R. A. 1973, Astron & Astrophys, 24, 337

Sharma, P., Parrish, I. J., Quataert, E. 2010, ApJ, 720, 652

Sharma, P., McCourt, M., Quataert, E., & Parrish, I.J. 2012, MNRAS, 420, 3174

Thompson, T. A., Quataert, E., Murray, N. 2005, ApJ, 630, 167

Vernaleo, J. C., & Reynolds, C. S. 2006, ApJ, 645, 83

Vikhlinin, A., Burenin, R., Forman, W.R., Jones, C., Hornstrup, A., Murray, S.S., & Quintana, H. 2007, in *Heating versus Cooling in Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies*, ed. H. Bohringer, G. W. Pratt, A. Finoguenov, & P. Schuecker, 48

Volonteri, M., Madau, P., Quataert, E., Rees, M. J. 2005, ApJ, 620, 69

Berti, E., & Volonteri, M. 2008, ApJ, 684, 822

Wise, M. W., McNamara, B. R., Nulsen, P. J., Houck, J. C., & David, L. P. 2007, ApJ, 659, 1153

Zhang, Y.-Y., et al. 2010, ApJ, 711, 1033